

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested in view of the above claim amendments and arguments presented below. Applicants assert that Claims 1-19 are patentable over the cited art of record.

35 U.S.C. Section 103 Rejections

The above referenced Office Action rejects independent Claims 1 and 10 and dependent Claims 2-9 and 11-19 as being obvious in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,897,622 (hereafter Blinn) and Examiner's Official Notice. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Applicants have amended independent Claims 1 and 10 to more particularly point out aspects of the present invention. As recited in Claims 1 and 10, the claimed invention implements multiple exchange instances for facilitating business-to-business e-commerce between different companies (e.g., customers, trading partners, and the like).

Specifically, independent Claims 1 and 10 have been amended to recite a common instance for implementing the exchanges, the exchanges sharing a set of common components and each exchange having a respective view having respective unique components, wherein the common instance is divided into a plurality of sub-schemas, and wherein each of the exchanges is implemented within a respective one of the sub-schemas providing a

respective partial view of the common instance. The independent claims explicitly recite dividing the common instance into a plurality of separate respective sub-schemas. Each of the exchanges is implemented within its own respective subschema.

In the Response to Arguments section of the above referenced Office Action, Applicants were directed to Column 5 lines 36-45 of Blinn, which is alleged to describe a common instance being divided into a plurality of sub-schemas. The cited section recites:

A browser 101, residing on the client 100, displays a store home page 103 retrieved from the World Wide Web on a viewing device 105. A user can view this page by entering, or selecting a link to, a Universal Resource Locator (URL), such as "www.store.com", in a browser program, such as Microsoft Explorer or Netscape Navigator, executing on the user's computer. Note that an online merchant system may reside in a server or in a combination of servers comprising the WAN 106. Similarly, the client 100 may access the network 104 through a wireless connection, such as the infrared link 107 or the satellite dish 109.

Applicants assert that the above cited text cannot be interpreted by one skilled in the art as describing a common instance for implementing the exchanges, the exchanges sharing a set of common components and wherein the common instance is divided into a plurality of sub-schemas, and wherein

each of the exchanges is implemented within a respective one of the sub-schemas providing a respective partial view of the common instance.

Further in the Response to Arguments section of the above referenced Office Action, Applicants were directed to Column 3 lines 25-30 of Blinn, which is alleged to describe a common instance being divided into a plurality of sub-schemas. The cited section recites:

Thus, a shopper using the present invention can view special promotion information during order processing operations. Similarly, the present invention uses the same calculations to display product information and to process an order, so a shopper is guaranteed consistency and reliability in the information used to make purchasing decisions.

Applicants assert that this is completely different from the claimed invention. Applicants assert that the division of a common schema of a database instance of a database into multiple separate sub-schemas and assigning each of the separate sub-schemas to different entities (e.g., having different applications, different properties, different access privileges, etc.) is different from the cited section of Blinn and the cited figure 2 (e.g., merchant system 120) of Blinn.

Applicants assert that the Blinn reference does not show a common instance divided into a plurality of sub-schemas each having a respective exchange.

Applicants point out that the "dynamic page generator 125" of Blinn is not the same as multiple sub-schemas of a single instance of a database. There is no disclosure in the Blinn figure 5, or in the description thereof, of the logical arrangement of the database 121.

Furthermore, Applicants traverse any assertion that the "dynamic page generator 125" of Blinn is equivalent to any multiple sub-schemas within the single schema of the common instance of a database as in the claimed invention. Applicants refer to Blinn figure 3A and figure 3B which show the internal components of the dynamic page generator 125 and depicted its function as merely accessing a database module 127, formatting in conjunction with HTML structures 126, and serving pages to the browser. Applicants find no discussion in the context of the dynamic page generator 125 of any logical arrangement, division, allocation, security arrangement, or other attributes of the division of a common schema of an instance of a database into multiple respective sub-schemas.

Applicants refer to the specification of the present application at page 14 lines 17 through 23 that recites:

Each of the exchanges 201-204 can be configured as “sub-schemas” that provide a partial view or customized view of the entire database. Hence, the common instance is “striped” to give the exchange operators their own exchanges (e.g., as in painting a stripe on the data which color codes for the respective owner/operator). In other words, in the present embodiment, the single schema of the common instance 200 is sliced into multiple exchanges 201-204.

Accordingly, Applicants assert that the limitations of the independent Claim 1 and independent Claim 10 describing the division of the schema of the common instance of the database into multiple sub-schemas and the implementation of respective exchanges within respective sub-schemas is different from any disclosure or teaching of the Blinn reference with respect to the "dynamic page generator 125". As such, Applicants assert that the present invention is not rendered obvious within the meaning of 35 USC Section 103 by the Blinn reference. Independent Claim 10 has been amended to specifically recite each of the exchanges with the respective sub-schemas being allocated to different merchants. This limitation is not shown by Blinn.

With regard to Examiner's Official Notice, Applicants point out that Blinn does not show the multiple exchange instance of Claim 1 wherein the multiple exchanges are configured to use communication protocols to communicate with processes external to the common instance (as described in dependent Claim 7) and a multiple exchange instance wherein the communication protocol with the external processes is XML (as described in


dependent Claim 8). Applicants traverse such Official Notice and request the Examiner provide extrinsic evidence supporting such an assertion.

CONCLUSION

All Claims (1-19) of the present application are now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application. Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 23-0085.

Respectfully submitted,
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO

Dated: 1/23, 2006



Glenn Barnes
Registration No. 42,293

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060